

**REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated November 4, 2004, and a subsequent telephonic correspondence with the Examiner. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his time in a telephone call to Applicant's representative Keith M. Tackett on November 30, 2005. In that telephone call, the Examiner asserted that claim 20 included the wrong status identifier and a previous amendment to claim 20 that was not entered due to a Notice of a Non-Compliant Amendment dated September 17, 2004.

Claims 15-31 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Applicant has re-submitted previous amendments to claims 15, 20, and 23 from a Response to Office Action mailed August 27, 2004 ("the response"). Applicant has also re-numbered claim 32 as claim 31 to correct a mis numbering error present in the response. Applicant further incorporates by reference the arguments presented in the response.

Applicant is under the belief that any amendments to the drawings and specification presented in the response have been entered as the Examiner has not called any inconsistencies to Applicant's attention. If not already entered, Applicant respectfully requests entry of the drawing and specification amendments presented in the response.

Claim 20 has been amended to correct matters of form. Claims 15 and 23 are amended to clarify the invention. These amendments are not presented to distinguish a reference, thus, the claims, as amended, are entitled to a full range of equivalents if not previously amended to distinguish a reference.

Claims 15-31 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,451. Applicants have previously filed a terminal disclaimer which obviates the

double patenting rejection over a prior patent. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, by claiming an "electrically symmetric" processing enclosure. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants submit that the specification is distinct in describing a dome made of a dielectric material that is transmissive to RF energy, preferably a ceramic such as aluminum oxide, aluminum nitride, or quartz. (see page 9, line 26 - page 10, line 2). Applicants submit that someone skilled in the art could make and use the dome as contemplated by the Applicants. Applicants further submit that "electrically symmetric" is a material attribute to electricity with respect to the formation of a symmetrical plasma within the dome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 15-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *van Os, et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,792,272. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. *Van Os, et al.* teaches a plasma chamber including an upper portion comprised of two distinct pieces: a cylindrical sidewall, made of a dielectric material and surrounded by RF coils, and a lid, made of aluminum (see column 6, lines 40-43) and having a removable gas injection manifold (see reference numeral 15, figure 3A). *Van Os, et al.*, does not teach, show, or suggest a substrate processing enclosure comprising a dome-shaped lid member made of a dielectric material, as recited in claims 15 and 23.

Further, *van Os, et al.* does not teach, show, or suggest an annular interior processing region tapering towards a lower end defining an exhaust passage, and a cantilever mounted substrate at a position above the exhaust passage, as recited in claim 15. The reference teaches a substrate support member (Fig. 6, 20) positioned below the taper, which is not in the lower end of the chamber body, but is above the process chamber (Fig. 6, 16). Withdrawal of the rejection to claim 15, and claims dependent therefrom, is respectfully requested.

PATENT  
Atty. Dkt. No. AMAT/1570.C2/DSM/HDP/CVD/JW

Having addressed all the issues presented by the Examiner's telephonic correspondence, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendments presented be entered and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Keith M. Tackett  
Registration No. 32,008  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Agent for Applicant(s)